UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspio.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. | |
|---|--------------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|--|
| 10/588,968 | 08/10/2006 | Ryuichi Okamoto | 2006_1217A | 4029 | |
| | 7590 04/29/201 I, LIND & PONACK I | EXAMINER | | | |
| 1030 15th Street, N.W. Suite 400 East Washington, DC 20005-1503 | | | HUERTA, ALEXANDER Q | | |
| | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | |
| | | | 2427 | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | NOTIFICATION DATE | DELIVERY MODE | |
| | | | 04/29/2011 | ELECTRONIC | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ddalecki@wenderoth.com eoa@wenderoth.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

| Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
|---------------------|----------------|--|
| 10/588,968 | OKAMOTO ET AL. | |
| Examiner | Art Unit | |
| Alexander Q. Huerta | 2427 | |

| | Alexander Q. Huerta | 2421 | | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe | ars on the cover sheet with the c | correspondence add | ress | | | | |
| THE REPLY FILED 14 April 2011 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. | | | | | | | |
| 1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following rapplication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods: | the same day as filing a Notice of A eplies: (1) an amendment, affidavital (with appeal fee) in compliance | Appeal. To avoid abar t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or | hich places the (3) a Request | | | | |
| a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date | of the final rejection. | | | | | | |
| b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adno event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la | ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing | date of the final rejection | n. | | | | |
| Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f |). | | | | | | |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of nave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the size forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL | ension and the corresponding amount on the content of the content | of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic | ate extension fee e action; or (2) as | | | | |
| 2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compl | iance with 37 CFB 41 37 must be f | iled within two months | s of the date of | | | | |
| filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi | sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to | avoid dismissal of the | | | | | |
| AMENDMENTS | | | | | | | |
| The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be (a) They raise new issues that would require further cor | | | cause | | | | |
| (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below | , | E below), | | | | | |
| (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or | · | ducing or simplifying th | ne issues for | | | | |
| (d) They present additional claims without canceling a c | orresponding number of finally reje | cted claims. | | | | | |
| NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). | | | | | | | |
| 1. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 | 1. See attached Notice of Non-Cor | mpliant Amendment (I | PTOL-324). | | | | |
| 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): | | | | | | | |
| Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be alled non-allowable claim(s). | owable if submitted in a separate, t | imely filed amendmer | nt canceling the | | | | |
| 7. Solution For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prove The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1.3 and 7-13. | | be entered and an ex | xplanation of | | | | |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: | | | | | | | |
| AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE | | | | | | | |
| The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). | | | | | | | |
| P. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary | vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea | l and/or appellant fails | s to provide a | | | | |
| IO. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER | of the status of the claims after er | ntry is below or attach | ed. | | | | |
| The request for reconsideration has been considered but <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u> | does NOT place the application in | condition for allowand | ce because: | | | | |
| 12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (13. Other: | PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s) | | | | | | |
| /Scott Reliveau/ | | | | | | | |
| /Scott Beliveau/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2427 | | | | | | | |
| Supervisory i atom Examinor, Art Offic 2421 | | | | | | | |

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's proposed amendments do not merely cancel claims, adopt examiner suggestions, remove issues for appeal, or in some other way require only a cursory review by the examiner. In particular the newly added limitation "A content reproduction terminal for reproducing content that is video or music of one of a plurality of genres including sport, drama, movie, and education..." Accordingly, further search and/or consideration is required on the part of the examiner.